



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 17

EDLIN SOLOMON
ST. SHAPIRA 5/3
RISHON LE ZION, 75284
ISRAEL

AIRMAIL

COPY MAILED

MAR 19 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Solomon Edlin
Application No. 09/871,383
Filed: May 31, 2001
Attorney Docket No.

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a), filed November 30, 2003, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

Any further petition to revive the above-identified application must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Petition under 37 CFR 1.137." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to provide a complete and timely reply to the Notice of File Missing Parts of Nonprovisional Application, mailed September 11, 2001.

A grantable petition to revive an abandoned application under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply (unless previously filed), which may be met by the filing of a continuing application in a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, but must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof in an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof; (2) the petition fee required by 37 CFR 1.17(l); (3) an adequate showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable; and (4) a terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) for an application filed prior to June 8, 1995. This petition lacks item (3).

35 USC 133 states, "Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Director in such action, the application shall

be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Director that such delay was unavoidable.”

As to item (3), the showing of record is inadequate to establish unavoidable delay within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 133 and 37 CFR 1.137(a). Specifically, an application is “unavoidably” abandoned only where petitioner, or counsel for petitioner, takes all action necessary for a proper response to the outstanding Office action, but through in the intervention of unforeseen circumstances, such as failure of mail, telegraph, facsimile, or the negligence of otherwise reliable employees, the response is not timely received in the Office. Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm’r Pat. 31 (Comm’r Pat. 1887).

In the instant case, petitioner has not provided any explanation as to why he was “unavoidably” prevented from supplying a complete reply to the Notice of September 11, 2001, but simply states that a “mistake was detected by me on 08.15.2003.” While an oversight or “mistake” in supplying a complete reply to an Office action is a sufficient basis on which to establish “unintentional delay,” such, however, does not constitute a basis for a finding that the delay in supplying a complete reply to the September 11, 2001 Notice was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 133 and 37 CFR 1.137(a). Therefore, petitioner has not demonstrated that all action for submitting a complete reply to the Notice was taken in this case to avoid abandonment thereof. See Ex parte Pratt, supra.

While the showing of record is not sufficient to establish to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the delay was unavoidable, petitioner is not precluded from obtaining relief by filing a petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) on the basis of unintentional delay. A grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by (1) the reply required to the outstanding Office action or notice, unless previously filed; (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);¹ (3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to paragraph (d) of this section.

The filing of a petition under the unintentional standard cannot be intentionally delayed and therefore should be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the delay from the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement of unintentional delay is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

¹ An addition of \$50.00 is required for processing a returned check.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop PETITION
Commissioner for Patents
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby
2011 South Clark Place
Room 1B03
Arlington, VA 22202

By fax: (703) 872-9306
Attn: Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Wan Laymon at (703) 306-5685.



Frances Hicks
Lead Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy